

REMARKS

Applicant amends claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 20 and 21 and add new claim 23. Accordingly, claims 1-23 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims define patentable subject matter.

I. Statement of Substance of Interview

As a preliminary matter, the undersigned thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of the interview conducted on February 2, 2010. During the interview, Applicant's representative discussed the patentability of independent claims 1, 8 and 15. In particular, Applicant's representative asserted that the cited prior art references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose "the at least one port module determines a last status of the data source and reconnects the remote application to the data source based on the determination of the last status of the data source", as recited in independent claims 1, 8 and 15. The Examiner indicated that the newly added features of claims 1, 8 and 15 appear to distinguish the claimed invention over the cited prior art references. However, the Examiner indicated that further search and consideration will be necessary.

II. Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Polizzi* in view of *Guenther*. Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Polizzi* and *Guenther* in view of *Brendel*. Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention would not have been rendered obvious in view of the combinations of the cited prior art.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “the at least one port module determines a last status of the data source and reconnects the remote application to the data source, without reinitializing the connection manager, based on the determination of the last status of the data source.” Applicant respectfully submit that the applied art does not teach or suggest these features of claim 1. These features are at least supported by page 21, line 16 to page 22, line 11 of the specification.

The claims that depend from claim 1 are patentable over the cited combination of references at least by virtue of their dependency and the additional features recited therein.

Independent claims 8 and 15 recite features similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1. Accordingly, claims 8 and 15, and the claims that depend therefrom, are patentable at least because the applied art does not teach or suggest the features of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

III. New claim

Applicant respectfully submits that new claim 23 depend from claim 1, and therefore is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency and the additional features recited therein. These features of new claim are at least supported by page 21, lines 16-23 of the specification.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
Application No.: 09/750,475

Attorney Docket No.: A8644
IBM REF.: STL919990134US3

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ebenesar D. Thomas/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/142133

46159

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Ebenesar D. Thomas
Registration No. 62,499

Date: February 4, 2010